REMARKS

Claims 2 and 5, as amended, remain herein.

Claims 2 and 5 have been amended more clearly to recite applicants' invention.

- 1. The title has been replaced with "Omnidirectional Visual Camera" to replace the title of the present application as filed for national examination under 35 U.S.C. 371.
- 2. Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 2 has been amended to moot the rejection. Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In claim 2, the phrase "rotating symmetric surface portion" has been replaced with "rotationally symmetric surface portion", the phrase "rotating secondary curved surface" has been replaced with "secondary rotationally symmetric curved surface", and the phrase "rotating center axis" has been replaced with "an axis of rotation." The phrase "projecting surface" has been deleted.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Kato et al. U.S. Patent 6,375,366. Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been cancelled, thereby mooting their rejection.

The presently claimed omnidirectional visual camera comprises a "connection section" recited in claim 2 as follows:

a connection section for connecting one longitudinal end of said cylindrical portion with the outer diameter portion of said rotationally symmetric surface portion;

Kato '366 does <u>not</u> disclose such an integrally molded "connection section." The Office Action alleges that the unlabeled cylindrical portion shown in Kato '366, Fig. 3 corresponds to applicants' cylindrical portion, but Kato '366, Fig. 3, does not show any structure connecting the unlabeled portion to reflecting surface 24B. Instead, the two portions are merely integral. Kato '366 does <u>not</u> disclose a connection section element connecting a cylindrical portion and an outer diameter of a reflecting portion, wherein the cylindrical

portion comprises cylindrical walls surrounding the reflecting portion and has a cylindrical inner diameter larger than an outer diameter of the reflecting portion, as recited in applicants' claim 2.

Moreover, the Office Action states that "the diameter of the cylinder (understood to refer to the unlabeled portion) that lies between the convex surface 24B and disk-like base 24A is less than the diameter of disk-like base 24A." However, disk-like base 24A is not a cylindrical portion having the structure recited in applicants' claim 2, which recites:

a cylindrical portion having cylindrical walls surrounding said rotationally symmetric surface portion...and having a cylindrical inner diameter larger than an outer diameter of said rotationally symmetric surface portion.

Applicants' cylindrical portion has cylindrical walls that (1) <u>surround</u> the reflecting portion, and (2) have an inner diameter that is <u>larger</u> than an outer diameter of the reflecting portion.

In contrast, as the Office Action admits, and as Kato '366, Fig. 3 shows, the unlabeled cylindrical portion has the <u>same</u> or substantially the same diameter as the diameter of reflecting

surface 24B, and therefore, the diameter of the unlabeled cylindrical portion is <u>not</u> larger than the outer diameter of the reflecting portion 24B, as recited in applicants' claim 2. Also, the unlabeled cylindrical portion does <u>not</u> surround reflecting portion 24B, as recited in applicants' claim 2.

For the foregoing reasons, Kato '366 fails to disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention, and therefore is not a proper basis for rejection under \$102. And, there is no disclosure or teaching in Kato '366 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claim 5, which depends from claim 2, is allowable for the same reasons as claim 2. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

4. Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ishiguro et al. U.S. Patent 6,157,018. Claims 1 and 3 have been cancelled, thereby mooting their rejection.

The presently claimed camera comprises a connection section for connecting one longitudinal end of a cylindrical portion with the outer diameter portion of the rotationally symmetric surface portion.

Ishiguro '018, Fig. 1, discloses mirror 1 attached to support 5 and cylindrical wall 3. Mirror 1, corresponding to applicants' rotationally symmetric surface portion, is attached to only two things: support 5, functioning as a base, and cylindrical wall 3, corresponding to applicants' cylindrical portion. Ishiguro '018 does not disclose an additional element functioning as a connection section, for connecting one longitudinal end of cylindrical portion 3 with the outer diameter portion of mirror 1, as recited by applicants' claim 2.

For the foregoing reasons, Ishiguro '018 does not contain any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Ishiguro '018 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof to anticipate or suggest

applicants' presently claimed invention. Claim 5, which depends from claim 2, is allowable for the same reasons as claim 2. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

5. Claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over King U.S. Patent 4,326,775. Claim 1 has been cancelled, thereby mooting its rejection.

The presently claimed camera comprises a connection section for connecting one longitudinal end of a cylindrical portion with the outer diameter portion of the rotationally symmetric surface portion.

King '775 discloses mirror 16, disk 15 and cylindrical wall

11. Mirror 16, corresponding to applicants' rotationally symmetric surface portion, is attached to only two things: disk

15, functioning as a base, and cylindrical wall 11, corresponding to applicants' cylindrical portion. King '775 does not disclose an additional element functioning as a connection section, for connecting one longitudinal end of

cylindrical wall 11 with the outer diameter portion of mirror 16, as recited by applicants' claim 2.

For the foregoing reasons, King '775 does not contain any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in King '775 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any portions thereof to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claim 5, which depends from claim 2, is allowable for the same reasons as claim 2. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 2 and 5 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 2 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

June 6, 2003

Date

Roger W. Parkhurst

Registration No. 25,177

Robert N. Wieland

Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: YMOR:216

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P. 1421 Prince Street, Suite 210 Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805

Telephone: (703) 739-0220